

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-46 and 75-136 were pending in this application.

Claims 2-19 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 12-15, 20-25, 29, 30, 35-38, 43-46, 75, 84-86, 91-96, 100, 101, 106-109, and 114-117 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,160,546 (hereinafter "Thompson") in view of Alexander et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 (hereinafter "Alexander"), and further in view of Burns U.S. Patent No. 6,014,137 (hereinafter "Burns").

Claims 3-5, 18, 19, 26-28, 41, 42, 76-79, 89, 90, 97-99, 112, and 113 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Alexander and Burns as applied to claims 1, 24, 75, 95 above, and further in view of Carr et al. U.S. Patent 6,209,129 (hereinafter "Carr").

Claims 8-11, 31-34, 80-83, and 102-105 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Alexander and Burns as applied to claims 1, 24, 75, 95 above, and further in view of Allen et al. U.S. Patent 5,892,535 (hereinafter "Allen").

Claims 16, 17, 39, 40, 87, 88, 110, and 111 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Alexander and Burns as applied to claims 1, 24, 75, 95 above, and further in view of Kikinis U.S. Patent 5,929,849 (hereinafter "Kikinis").

Claims 133-136 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Alexander in view of Kikinis.

### II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Claims 1-46 and 75-117 have been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, the rejections recited in Section I concerning these claims are not being addressed in connection with this Reply.

Claims 133-136 have been amended to more particularly define the invention. No new matter would be introduced by the amendment of these claims.

### III. Summary of Telephonic Interview

The Examiner and applicants' representatives conducted a telephonic interview on April 22, 2004. Applicants and applicants' representatives wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview. During the telephonic interview, applicants' representatives and the Examiner discussed potential amendments that could be made to the claims to further define the invention.

Applicants' representatives agreed to prepare amendments to claims 133-136, such as those amendments provided in this paper, to overcome the prior art of record.

IV. Reply to the Rejection of Claims 133-136

Claims 133-136 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Alexander in view of Kikinis. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants' independent claims 133-136 are directed to systems, a method, and a machine-readable medium in which local and global advertisements are distributed to user television equipment on which an interactive television program guide is implemented. Claims 133-136 have been amended to specify distributing global and local advertisements to the user television equipment, wherein the local advertisements are designated for display in a particular geographic region. The interactive television program guide is used to display the global advertisements. The claims further specify receiving a user selection of the global advertisements. Claims 133-136 have been amended to specify displaying a local advertisement that is distinct from but corresponds to the global advertisement selected by the user in response to receiving the user selection. The local advertisement displays only local information that is

specific to the particular geographic region for which it is designated.

Kikinis refers to a system that enables a user to select an emblem, which upon selection opens a WEB page according to an URL associated with the emblem.

Nowhere in Kikinis does it show or suggest displaying a local advertisement that is distinct from but corresponds to the global advertisement selected by the user. Nor does Kikinis show or suggest displaying local advertisements that only have local information that is specific to the particular geographic region for which it is designated. Rather, Kikinis merely displays a WEB site when a user selects an emblem being displayed. Nothing in Kikinis shows or suggests that the WEB site displays a distinct local advertisement corresponding to a selected global advertisement that only displays local information pertinent to the particular geographic region for which it (the local advertisement) is designated. In stark contrast to the distinct local advertisement, as claimed in claims 133-136, the WEB site freely displays all sorts of information that is non-distinct and is not specifically designated for display in any particular geographic location.

Applicants respectfully submit that the local information being displayed by the local advertisement must

necessarily be associated with a particular geographic region. Kikinis fails to show or suggest this necessity.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 133-136 be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 133-136 are allowable. This application is therefore in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Alexander Shvarts  
Registration No. 47,943  
Attorney for Applicants  
FISH & NEAVE  
Customer No. 1473  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000